REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 10 - 18 remain pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 11 – 17 were objected to because of certain informalities set forth in numbered paragraph 2 on pages 2 and 3 of the Action. Claims 11 -17 have been amended to begin with "The" rather than "A". Claim 10, 11 and 17 have been amended to more positively recite an action to be performed.

It is submitted that the claims have now been amended to satisfy the various objections of the Examiner set forth in numbered paragraph 2.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is stated to be directed to non-statutory subject matter for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 4 on pages 3 and 4 of the Action.

Claims 10 – 18 have all been amended to now recite "A computer implemented service of searching documents".

It is submitted that these amendments satisfy the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13, 15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 5-7 on pages 4 and 5 of the Action.

Claims 13, 15 and 17 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the terms "client" and "server".

Claim 18 has been amended to make the preamble distinct from the body of the claims to more clearly define the claimed invention.

It is submitted that the claims all now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spencer U. S. patent No. 5,826,261.

For the reasons set forth hereafter, it is submitted that claims 10 – 18 all patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Patentability Of The Claims

The invention as now defined in the amended claims is directed to a computer implemented service of searching documents wherein servers comprising document databases and programs to manipulate the database are dispersed over a network and a client connected to the servers performs a document search. The computer implemented service provides a document search method comprising the steps of:

(1) inputting to a first document database at least one document retrieved as a result of a first search of the first document database; wherein the first search is conducted by a first search input, to the first document database, of a set of keywords, fragments of a document or any desired set of documents;

8

(2) making a weighted term list from the input of the at least one document to the first document database, the weight of each term reflecting the importance of the term in the first document database; and

(3) performing a search of a second document database, wherein the weighted term list is used as a second search input for performing the search of the second document database, and wherein search term in the term list is weighted considering the importance of term both in the first document database and the second document database, and the weight is used to calculate the relevance of each document of the second document database.

By this invention, the client can obtain a set of documents in the second document database which relates to an arbitrary set of key documents in the first document database, so that network traffic is reduced to a small amount without complicated system. Spencer does not teach this invention.

Spencer discloses a system and method for querying multiple, distributed databases and merging the retrieved result. *See,* for example, Figs. 1, 3, 4, 6. This method is referred to as a "meta search". In a meta search engine, keywords are submitted in its search box, and it transmits a search simultaneously to several individual search engines and their databases of web pages. Within a short time, results are received back from all the search engines queried. Meta search engines do not own a database of Web pages. They send the search terms to the databases maintained by search engine companies.

Applicants' invention performs a database search from a first database to a second database by making a query of the documents from the search result of the

first database and then searching a second database related to the query documents.

By contrast, the method of Spencer is only a meta search, done by querying multiple databases and merging the result. There is no description or suggestion about a database search from a first database to a second database by making a query of documents from the search result of first a database and searching a second database related to the query documents.

The method of Spencer thus is quite different from Applicants' invention and therefore the present invention as now claimed is patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. NIT-163-02).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Gene W. Stockman
Registration No. 21,021

GWS/cmd
(703) 684-1120

10